



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,893	09/19/2000	John Michael Everson	30604	5121

33272 7590 05/26/2005

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.  
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY  
MAILSTOP: KSOPHT0101-22100  
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
----------

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/664,893	EVERSON ET AL.
	Examiner Pramila Parthasarathy	Art Unit 2136

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 21-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: See attachment.

**Advisory Action**

1. This office action is in response to the after-final response/remarks filed on May 05, 2005. The proposed amendment corrects the typographical errors in the dependency of the Claims 21 – 26. They do not overcome prior art rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to 35 USC 112 has been fully considered and is persuasive. The rejection of Claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 26 has been withdrawn.

3. The applicant in regards to Claims 1 – 4, 7 – 10, 21 and 24 argue that the Alegre et al. do not disclose "an object associated with the Session ID is stored dynamically in a directory on a directory server coupled with the authorization server", "The directory Server permits other computer applications launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID on the user's computer" and "the other applications are launched". These arguments are not found persuasive.

Alegre discloses that an object associated with the Session ID (cookie with the session key) is stored dynamically in a directory in a directory server coupled with the authentication server (Alegre Column 5 line 8 – Column 6 line 22), wherein object (cookie) consists of a Session ID (session key) that is stored

in the directory. Alegre further discloses the directory server permits other computer applications launched by the computer user to reference the Session ID on the user computer (Alegre Column 5 line 48 – Column 6 line 49), and the other applications access the object for the computer user on the directory server to authenticate or authorize the user for the other computer applications (Column 6 lines 6 – 68), wherein the server determines the validity of the Session ID before permitting accessing the resources and the accessing requests that may include one or more requests for operations by resources (other applications) (Alegre Column 8 lines 16 – 27).

4. Regarding claims 5, 6, 11 and 12, Applicant argues that the Hartman fails to correct for the deficiencies in Alegre. Alegre discloses the limitations of Claim 1 and 7 as discussed above and Hartman discloses a shopping cart and storing the shopping cart along with the object (e.g. unique identifier, Session key, UID, PWD, expiration criteria, etc.) and other user-specific information (Harman Column 3 line 31 – Column 4 lines 46).

5. Regarding newly added Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26, Applicant argues that Blanco et al do not use LDAP or X.500 to access object". This argument is not found persuasive as Alegre discloses dynamic directory services used by the other applications to access the object stored in the directory server as discussed above and Blanco discloses a network access authentication system that gathers the data concerning the users, including authentication data, in a data base of a

directory, which uses Light weight directory access protocol which is specifically targeted at management applications and browsing applications that provide interactive access to directories (Blanco Column 3 lines 22 – 67). ). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Alegre with Blanco because LDAP provides the authentication data stored in the directory available to all the applications that are associated with a directory server and provides interactive access to directories.

6. Accordingly, the rejection for the pending claims 1 – 12 and 21 – 26 is respectfully maintained.

7. Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.



AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100